<u>REMARKS</u>

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Action mailed October 12, 2006. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart, et al. in view of Periyannan, et al. Independent claims 1 and 11 recite in general an ability to receive a first request having a first uniform resource identifier and a header portion, compare the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion to transform criteria to identify a specific transform associated with the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion, and generate a second request having a second uniform resource identifier based on the specific transform, the first uniform resource identifier, and the header portion. By contrast, the Examiner readily admits that the Stewart, et al. patent fails to disclose an ability to compare the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion to transform criteria to identify a specific transform associated with the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion. Moreover, the Stewart, et al. patent provides no disclosure for generating a second request by performing the action associated with the specific transform on the header portion and the first uniform resource identifier to yield the second resource identifier. The portions of the Stewart, et al. patent cited by the Examiner are only directed to storing an image in an image storing device according to an image identification string. At no point does the Stewart, et al. patent generate a second request having a second uniform resource identifier nor does the Stewart, et al. patent identify a specific transform from a first uniform resource

identifier and a header portion of a first request to apply to the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion in generating the second resource identifier for the second request as required by the claimed invention.

To overcome the deficiencies of the Stewart, et al. patent, the Examiner proposes to combine the Periyannan, et al. patent with the Stewart, et al. patent. However, the portion of the Periyannan, et al. patent cited by the Examiner is merely directed to a determination as to whether a request is for a cacheable or non-cacheable object. If for a cacheable object, the request is merely passed to the cache. If for a non-cacheable object, the request is merely passed to the content server. There is no generation of a second request having a second uniform resource identifier being performed in the Periyannan, et al. patent. Thus, the Periyannan, et al. patent fails to disclose an ability to compare the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion to transform criteria to identify a specific transform associated with the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion for use in generating the second uniform resource identifier for the second request. Thus, neither the Stewart, et al. nor Periyannan, et al. patents identify a specific transform defining an action to be performed on the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion associated with a first request based on a comparison to transform criteria where the specific transform is used in the generation of a second uniform resource identifier for a second request as required by the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-20 are patentably distinct from the proposed Stewart, et al. - Periyannan, et al. combination.

Contrary to the Examiner's position, the Stewart, et al. and Periyannan, et al. patents fail to disclose the retrieval of a second content item in response to receipt of a first request requesting a first content item. Both the Stewart, et al. and Periyannan, et al. patents retrieve the content item originally requested. The Stewart, et al. patent merely uses the uniform resource locator of the request as part of a directory string identifying where the file associated with the uniform resource locator of the request is stored. The Stewart, et al. patent fails to transform the request to a second request associated with a second content item as required by the claimed invention. At no point does the Stewart, et al. patent generate a second uniform resource identifier associated with the second content item let alone from the first resource identifier, header portion, and specific transform.. The Periyannan, et al. patent also fails to disclose a capability to generate a second uniform resource identifier from the first resource identifier, header portion, and specific transform as required in the claimed invention. Accordingly, the claimed invention is patentably distinct from the Stewart, et al. and Periyannan, et al. patents.

This Response to Examiner's Final Action is necessary to address the Examiner's characterization of the cited art in support of the rejections to the claims. This Response to Examiner's Final Action could not have been presented earlier as the Examiner has only now provided the current characterization of the cited art.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending Claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicant stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments associated with this Application to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicants

Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

December 12, 2006

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX   75201-2980

(214) 953-6507

Customer Number: 05073